

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 24, 2005. Claims 13 to 27 are pending in the application, of which Claims 13 and 21 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 13 to 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,862,285 (Miyakawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,394,693 (Shirley). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 13 is directed to a printing system including an image processing section and a printing section to perform printing on a printing medium based on image data. The system includes a memory for storing the image data, first processing means for executing image data magnifying processing based on first magnifying rate information, and second processing means for executing the image data magnifying processing for an image to be printed based on the image data magnified by the first processing means, based on second magnifying rate information indicating the magnifying rate greater than 100%, wherein the image data magnified by the first processing means is stored in the memory, and the first magnifying rate information is determined based on at least one of a resolution of printing performed by the printing section, a processing load to be borne by the first processing means, a capacity of the memory and a resolution shown by the image data, and a magnifying rate of the image to be printed on the printing medium based on the image data, such that the higher the resolution of printing is, the smaller the processing load is, the larger the capacity of the memory is, or the lower the resolution shown by the image data is, said first magnifying rate becomes larger and said second magnifying rate becomes smaller, and wherein said second processing means controls the number of times of repetition of pixels shown by the

image data magnified by said first processing means to magnify the image data, based on said second magnifying information.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the foregoing features of amended independent Claim 13, particularly with respect to at least the features of a first processing means for executing image data magnifying processing based on a first and second magnifying rate are selected such that the higher the resolution of printing is, the smaller the processing load is, the larger the capacity of the memory is, or the lower the resolution shown by the image data is, the first magnifying rate becomes larger and the second magnifying rate becomes smaller with a second processing means controlling the number of times of repetition of pixels shown by the image data magnified by said a processing means to magnify the image data, based on said second magnifying information.

In contrast, Miyakawa discloses a magnifying processing by way of an optical configuration including a lens. The optical magnifying process is performed and further magnifying processing for the image obtained by the optical configuration is executed by means of an electrical process. Therefore, Miyakawa fails to disclose magnifying processing by a first processing means which is embodied in software and a second processing means controlling the number of times of repetition of pixels making up an image to magnify the image. Furthermore, Miyakawa fails to disclose that the first and second magnifying rate are determined such that the higher the resolution of printing is, the smaller the processing load is, the larger the capacity of the memory is, or the lower the resolution shown by the image data is, the first magnifying rate becomes larger and the second magnifying rate becomes smaller.

Furthermore, Shirley is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Miyakawa in respect to the present invention. Shirley is seen to be directed to a system for enlarging or reducing an image by inserting or by deleting rows and lines of the image data array, respectively. (Shirley, abstract; Figs. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 14 to 68; and column 3, lines 1 to 10.) Shirley, however, is not seen to disclose a first and second magnifying rate that are determined such that the higher the resolution of printing is, the smaller the processing load is, the larger the capacity of the memory is, or the lower the resolution shown by the image data is, the first magnifying rate becomes larger and the second magnifying rate becomes smaller..

As discussed above, neither of the applied references are seen to teach the significant features of the present invention. In addition, even if Miyakawa and Shirley were combined, for which combination no motivation or suggestion is seen to be provided, such a combination would not be seen to disclose or suggest the foregoing combination of features of amended independent Claim 13.

Accordingly, amended independent Claim 13 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. In addition, amended independent Claim 21 is a method claim substantially corresponding to amended independent Claim 13 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended independent Claim 13.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', is written over a horizontal line.

Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 94524v1